



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
1322 PATTERSON AVENUE, SE, SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, DC 20374-5065

5720
Ser BD/071

MAY 03 2017

Ms. Kathryn Watson
Daily Caller News Foundation
1050 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036

Dear Ms. Watson,

Subj: YOUR FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (FOIA) CASE NUMBER DON-NAVY-2017-006011

A referral was received from the Naval Inspector General who is currently processing your FOIA request DON-NAVY-2016-009522. The referral was received on May 2, 2017 and assigned case number DON-NAVY-2017-006011.

We have identified nine pages of documents that are responsive to your request. Portions of these materials are being withheld under the following FOIA Exemptions; (5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6)) which protects personnel and medical files and similar files, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy; and (5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(2)) which protects information related solely to the internal personnel rules and practices of an agency.

You have the right to appeal this response. An appeal must be received within 30 calendar days of the date of this letter. Since you have created an account in FOIAonline, you may submit an appeal directly within the web-based system. To do this, you would log in to your account, retrieve your original request, and then click on the "Create Appeal" tab in the left-hand column. The basic information from your request will be duplicated for you, and you can type in the basis of your appeal. If you prefer to use regular mail, you may submit an appeal to The Department of the Navy, Office of the General Counsel (ATTN: FOIA APPEALS), 1000 Navy Pentagon, Room 5A532, Washington, DC 20350-1000. Your appeal, if any, must be postmarked within 90 calendar days from the date of this letter and should include a copy of your initial request, a copy of this letter, and a statement indicating why you believe your appeal should be granted. I recommend that your appeal and its envelope both bear the notation, "Freedom of Information Act Appeal."

Further questions regarding the action this office has taken may be directed to Abby Machalec, abby.machalec@navy.mil. Please refer to your FOIA case number DON-NAVY-2017-006011 whenever corresponding about this request.

Sincerely,

P. A. POLLOCK
Chief Management Officer

Copy to:
COMNAVFACENGCOM (IG)

Investigative Report (NIGHTs Case # 201401610)

**NAVFAC Northwest Investigative Report
19 June 2014**

1. Investigator(s) and Identifying Information and Location of Working Papers

a. Investigator(s) and Identifying Information. (b) (6) GS-13, Command Inspector General, Naval Facilities Engineering Command Northwest (NAVFAC NW), Tel: (360) 936-0007, e-mail: (b) (6) @navy.mil.

b. Location of working papers. NAVFAC NW, Locked Cabinet, Office of the Inspector General, Attn: 09IG, 1101 Tautog Circle, Silverdale WA, 98315-1101

2. Background and Summary

a. NIGHTS Control number, Dates of Receipt, and Tasking Dates. Case formally assigned the Navy Inspector General Hotline Tracking System (NIGHTS) control number 201401610 on the same date of receipt of the complaint, 27 May 2014. IO performed a Preliminary Inquiry from 27 May to 04 June 2014. Navy Inspector General (NAVIG) granted permission for full investigation on 04 June 2014.

b. Summary of Complaint.

(1) On 27 May 2014, at 08:18 AM, the NAVFAC Northwest Inspector General received a complaint via email from (b) (6) NAVFAC Northwest Base Support Vehicle & Equipment (BSVE) Product Line Coordinator (PLC), (Exhibit 1). (b) (6) forwarded emails from Multiple Public Works Department Everett (PWDE) personnel reporting possible misuse of a government-owned vehicle (GOV) by (b) (6) the PWDE Installation Energy Manager. The allegations indicated (b) (6) checked out a GOV on Wednesday, 14 May 2014, and traveled to the Naval Pacific Beach Installation (MWR resort) on Thursday 15 May 2014. While at Pacific Beach, (b) (6) engaged in conversation with two other PWDE employees, (b) (6) (6) (PWDE Engineering Tech) and (b) (6) (PWDE Engineering Tech. (b) (6) and (b) (6) claimed that (b) (6) indicated to them that he had traveled from Redmond that morning to get to Pacific Beach. As (b) (6) was exiting Pacific Beach later in that same day, (b) (6) noted that (b) (6) was driving a GOV. (b) (6) suspected (b) (6) had driven the GOV from his home in Redmond. Subsequently, both (b) (6) and (b) (6) reported the possible misuse of a GOV by (b) (6) to their supervisor and the PWDE Transportation Operations Supervisor, (b) (6) on 16 May 2014.

(2) (b) (6) reported the suspected GOV misuse and his observations of (b) (6) actions to (b) (6) PWDE Transportation Specialist via email on 20 May 2014, at 12:43 AM. His email stated (b) (6) had checked out a GOV on Wednesday, 14 May 2014 for use on Thursday, the 15th, to conduct official business at

Pacific Beach, and use on Friday the 16th for a meeting with the NAVFAC Northwest Commanding Officer, and the vehicle was to be returned upon completion of business on Friday the 16th. Due to his concerns regarding reports by (b) (6) and (b) (6), (b) (6) indicated at approximately 0650 hours on Monday, 19 May 2014, he checked the night time drop box for keys to the GOV. (b) (6) had checked out and the keys had not been returned. (b) (6) called (b) (6) work phone at approximately 0730 hours and noted the phone was forwarded. When (b) (6) answered, he indicated to (b) (6) he would return the car shortly. At approximately 0827 hours, (b) (6) observed (b) (6) drive through the main gate at Naval Station Everett (NSE) in the GOV, license plate number (G134707N) and proceed to the NEX Citgo gas station to refuel the vehicle. (b) (6) returned the vehicle to the short term GOV parking area and returned the keys to the vehicle dispatch desk. The total mileage for duration of the trip was 439.1 miles.

d. Summary of the outcome of investigation.

(1) In regards to the allegation (b) (6) used a GOV to transport himself from his place of employment to his residence in violation of 31 U.S. Code 3344, 41 CFR 102-34.200, DoD Instruction 4500.36, and NAVFAC Publication 300, from 14 May to 19 May 2014, both his own statements and witness testimony substantiate the allegation. (b) (6) admitted to the infraction in his sworn and written statements (Exhibits 2 & 3 respectively). Two witnesses indicated (b) (6) claimed to have traveled from Redmond, Washington, the morning of the 15 May, and (b) (6) admits this was the case. (b) (6) witnessed (b) (6) drive on base with the GOV the morning of the 19 May. (b) (6) admits to maintaining the vehicle at his residence from the night of the 14 May until 19 May, when he returned the vehicle to the Everett Transportation Lot. (b) (6) further implicated himself in taking a GOV to his residence on 4 previous occasions beginning on 03 October 2014, but claims the circumstances of his infractions are mitigated by his attention to ORM/safety, the savings to the Navy of energy/resources, and his supervisor, (b) (6) giving him permission to take the vehicle to his residence. However, (b) (6) indicated he did not know (b) (6) was staging a GOV at his residence, nor did he give permission to (b) (6) to do so (Exhibit 4). Further, (b) (6) who has personally checked out GOVs to (b) (6) indicated he has specifically told (b) (6) that driving a GOV to his home is prohibited by regulation. (b) (6) further provided five PWDE transportation Rental Agreement forms signed by (b) (6) detailing use guidelines and regulations (Exhibits 5 and 7).

3. First allegation.

(1) That (b) (6) PWDE Installation Energy Manager, GS-12, on divers occasions from 14 May through 19 May 2014, used a government vehicle to transport himself from his place of employment to his residence in violation of 31 U.S. Code 3344, 41 CFR 102-34.200, DoD Instruction 4500.36, and NAVFAC Publication 300.

a. Facts

(1) According to documents provided to the IO by (b)(6) of 29 May 2014, via email, (b)(6) made a reservation for (b)(6) to use a GOV on 12 May 2014. The reservation was for an official working trip to the Pacific Beach Naval Installation for construction inspection, and a trip to Bangor for a meeting with the NAVFAC Northwest Commanding Officer. The scheduled time of pick-up was before lunch on 14 May 2014, with a return date of 16 May 2014. According to (b)(6) he personally took the reservation from (b)(6) because it was his own hand writing on the reservation form (Exhibit 6).

(2) On 14 May 2014, at 1000 AM, (b)(6) checked out a GOV License plate number G134707N from the PWDE Transportation shop. (b)(6) stated he did not personally check the vehicle out to (b)(6) on this date. He specified that the hand writing on the Rental Agreement form, Dated 14 May 2014, was that of (b)(6) who was recently detailed to transportation. The Rental Agreement form was signed by (b)(6) on 14 May 2014 (Exhibit 7).

(3) The Rental Agreement form used by PWDE Transportation contains highly explicit information and instructions regarding the proper use, and warnings of liabilities and penalties for the misuse of a GOV (Exhibit 7). Specifically, the agreement stipulates the following:

Domicile to Duty (Home to Work)

The use of DoD motor Vehicles shall not be authorized for transporting DoD or other personnel over all or any part of the route between their domiciles and places of employment unless authorized by SECNAV (non-delegable). Examples of home to work misuse would be transporting personnel going on or off duty to or from gates, parking lots, BEQs, BOQs, even if the driver was going to use that route for official purposes.

Penalties for Misuse of DoD Motor Vehicles

Civilian Personnel. Any officer or employee of the Government who willfully uses or authorized any use of any U.S. Government-owned or leased passenger motor vehicle (except for official purposes as authorized by 31, U.S.C. Section 1344 (b), reference (c)), or otherwise violates section 1344 shall be suspended for duty by the head of the DoD component concerned, without compensation, for not less than 1 month and shall be suspended for a longer period or summarily removed from office if circumstances warrant (31 U.S.C. 1349 (b), reference (d)).

(4) In his 10 June 2014 interview, the IO asked if (b)(6) if he had read the Rental Agreement and he indicated "I haven't read through it fully. I saw where I needed to sign my name, flipped it over. See the 100 miles distance they always talk about the fact that if it's more than 100 miles requires approval. My previous discussion with the DPWO, I thought I covered that." Regarding his statement "My previous discussion with

the DPWO, I thought I covered that." (b) (6) indicated he believed his current direct supervisor, the Deputy Public Works Officer (DPWO), (b) (6) had given him permission to take a vehicle to his residence, thus mitigating the formal restrictions on domicile to work use of a GOV.

(5) (b) (6) stated in both his written statement and sworn statement that in October of 2014, he had a discussion with (b) (6) in which (b) (6) stated, "Given the fiscal climate, to save the Navy travel overtime expenses, and to drive while not exhausted, if I could not find travel partners coming from Everett in a GOV, of my intent to drive a GOV to the Pacific Beach job site from Redmond and return at the end of the day to Redmond with a return of the GOV the next business day. My recollection is that the DPWO stated that given the circumstances he might do the same. Although I did sign the Rental Agreement form, I thought that my October discussion with the DPWO regarding my travel plans to stage a vehicle at Redmond, to reduce drive times sufficed as prior notification." (Exhibits 2 & 3)

(6) (b) (6) indicated in his sworn statement that he has had multiple discussions with multiple personnel regarding the counterintuitive nature of the directive regarding the use of GOVs. He agrees that personnel are logging overtime and driving more just to comply with the directive but he did not give (b) (6) permission to take a GOV home and we was not aware (b) (6) was using a GOV in that manner (Exhibit 4).

(7) (b) (6) recalled in his sworn statement that (b) (6) had in fact talked to him about not taking a vehicle to his residence. He stated, "I did have a conversation with (b) (6) about it. He works for the Deputy. Again I thought my conversation with the Deputy related to the most expeditious, cheapest, and safest route met the requirements of gaining the Deputy's, you know informing the Deputy and getting the Deputy's acknowledgement of my plan." (b) (6) claimed in his sworn statement that several months ago, (b) (6) approached him about taking a GOV to his residence and questioned whether it wouldn't be more cost effective to leave from his residence (Exhibit 5). (b) (6) claimed he distinctly remembered informing (b) (6) that under no circumstances could (b) (6) drive a GOV to his residence that it would require congressional authority for permission and (b) (6) would have to be under a specific capacity.

(8) (b) (6) could not give a specific date of his conversation with (b) (6) but provided a highlighted copy of a Rental Agreement form, signed by (b) (6) on 13 March 2014 (Exhibit 8). (b) (6) believed he highlighted the ("Please read the following before taking responsibility for any government vehicle") portion of the form to point out the stipulations on the form to (b) (6).

(9) According to (b) (6) testimony, he checked the GOV out on the 14 May, drove the vehicle to his residence in Redmond, Washington, and parked it on the street where it remained overnight. He then drove the vehicle from his residence to Pacific Beach on the morning of the 15 May taking the most direct route to Pacific Beach. (b) (6) agreed that he encountered two PWDE, employees, (b) (6) and

(b) (6) at Pacific Beach on the 15th. (b) (6) was not able to recall the specifics of his conversations with these employees other than some casual discussion about work. (b) (6) indicated he left Pacific Beach and returned to Redmond, parking the GOV at his residence.

(10) (b) (6) the initial complainant in the case, indicated in his sworn statement on 03 June 2014 and email documentation forwarded to (b) (6) on 19 May 2014, that (b) (6) had discussed leaving from Redmond on the morning of the 15 May to get to Pacific Beach (Exhibits 1 and 9 respectively). (b) (6) further indicated he witnessed (b) (6) drive off the Pacific Beach facility in a government CMAX hybrid vehicle. (b) (6) didn't think much about his conversation with (b) (6) or witnessing him leave the facility until the drive home with (b) (6). He claimed it dawned on him that (b) (6) lived in Redmond and indicated he left from Redmond and was driving a GOV. Armed with his suspicions, on 16 May 2014, (b) (6) discussed the matter with his direct supervisor, (b) (6) who directed (b) (6) to turn the complaint over to (b) (6) in the Transportation Office

(11) On 16 May 2014, both (b) (6) and (b) (6) informed (b) (6) of their observations and suspicions. (b) (6) requested both personnel provide a written statement. (b) (6) provided an email statement to (b) (6) on 19 May 2014, and (b) (6) provided an email statement to (b) (6) on 20 May 2014. Both written statements demonstrate agreement between (b) (6) and (b) (6) that (b) (6) indicated he had traveled from Redmond the morning of 15 May to get to Pacific Beach (Exhibit 1).

(12) On 19 May 2014, (b) (6) forwarded an email regarding his concerns of possible misuse of a GOV by (b) (6) to his supervisor, (b) (6) (retired 30 May 2014). (Exhibit 1) This email stated:

"I received a phone call from (b) (6) the morning of 16 May, bringing an issue of potential misuse to my attention. (b) (6) provides additional details via his email below.

Yesterday AM, approx. 0650 hrs. I checked the drop box for keys that may have been returned over the weekend; there were none. In an effort to get subject vehicle back, and have it prepared for subsequent rentals, at approximately 0730 hrs. I called (b) (6) work phone. It was forwarded to another phone, which he answered. I inquired when he would be returning the GOV. He told me he would have it back shortly. Under suspicion that he had taken the vehicle to his place of residence, and would be commuting to work from that location, I opted to go to parking lot "B" and observe vehicles entering the base. I observed (b) (6) driving through the main gate in vehicle G134707N at 0827 hrs. He proceeded to the NEX Citgo gas station, where he refueled the vehicle. He returned the vehicle to the short term rental parking area a short time afterwards, and subsequently returned the keys to the vehicle dispatch desk. Total mileage

for duration of rental: 439.1"

(13) On 19 May 2014, (b)(6) forwarded the above information to (b)(6) the Core Base Support Vehicle & Equipment Product Line Coordinator, including (b)(6) and (b)(6) email statements (Exhibit 1). (b)(6) indicates in his email:

"We have suspected recently from rumors from multiple sources that (b)(6) has been taking the checked out government vehicles to his home and then leaving early the next morning to go to oversee his projects. (b)(6) has talked to (b)(6) about taking the vehicle home to save travel time to these projects and he was adamantly told NO! UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES! He has also signed the attached form that we make all cpool users sign that deals specifically, in the second paragraph, with Domicile to Duty so there is not any doubt that he is unaware of the restrictions."

(14) (b)(6) claimed in his 28 May 2014, sworn statement that he had been suspicious of (b)(6) on several occasions; his office was right next to (b)(6) and has heard (b)(6) tell (b)(6) how stupid it was that he couldn't drive the vehicle home (Exhibit 10). He claimed (b)(6) complained about having to come up to the base to grab a vehicle just to drive back past where he lived to go down to Pacific Beach. (b)(6) claimed he heard (b)(6) remind (b)(6) that it wasn't their rules with was the government's rules and it's an automatic 30 days suspension if caught. He indicated he heard this conversation at least twice between (b)(6) and (b)(6) and that, along with the paper work, means there is not chance (b)(6) didn't understand the rules.

(15) (b)(6) disclosed both in his sworn and written statements (Exhibits 2 & 3) that he had in fact been taking a GOV to his home since 03 October 2013. Claiming he had permission from the DPWO, (b)(6) began taking a vehicle to his residence, parking it on the street and leaving from his residence in the morning to perform official Command business. As close as he could remember, he did this on 03 October 2013, 29 October 2013, 09 December 2013, 07 March 2014 and 15 – 19 May 2014. During the final incident from 15 – 19 May, he staged the vehicle at his home the night of the 14 May, used the vehicle to travel to Pacific Beach on the 15 May, staged the vehicle at his residence the night of the 15 May, traveled from his residence to NAVFAC Northwest at Naval Base Kitsap and returned the vehicle to his residence on 16 May. NAVFAC Northwest Executive Officer, (b)(6) confirmed that (b)(6) attended a formal meeting with the Commanding officer on 16 May 2014 (Exhibit 11). The vehicle remained at (b)(6) residence until the morning of the 19 May when he drove the vehicle from his residence, entered through the main gate of NSE, filled the vehicle at the NEX filling station and returned the vehicle to the PWDE Transportation lot.

(16) (b)(6) listed multiple mitigating circumstances in his statements.

1. (b) (6) indicated, he was asked by DPWO (b) (6) to perform additional duty tasks in the PWDE Area of Responsibility (AOR). He agreed to perform the tasks but told (b) (6) due to where he lives, safety and energy efficiency concerns of his intentions to leave from and return to his residence using a GOV. He claimed after discussing this with (b) (6) indicated back to him "Given the circumstances I might do the same."
2. (b) (6) indicated he saves the government two hours in overtime for each round trip if he stages the vehicle at his residence, south of Everett.
3. (b) (6) claims driving a single occupancy vehicle from his residence, to Everett to Pacific beach and returning via that route is a 10 hour total commute. Staging the vehicle from his residence saves him from driving while tired and drowsy and mitigates this safety concern.
4. According to (b) (6) it's difficult to obtain reimbursable travel approval through DTS so he had even driven his POV to Pacific beach without asking for mileage reimbursement. He claims the trips to Pacific Beach are not planned out far enough in advance to use DTS.
5. (b) (6) stated he has never fully read the Rental Agreement form.

(17). (b) (6) the PWDE, NAVOSH Safety Officer acted as a witness for (b) (6) during his sworn statement on 10 June 2014. (b) (6) stated during (b) (6) interview that that (b) (6) hadn't been with the government long and approaches the use of a GOV with the mindset of energy conservation. (b) (6) indicated a black and white rule had been bent a bit but (b) (6) is a professional, does his job professionally and has won awards for the base for conserving energy. (b) (6) further claimed (b) (6) concerns about safety are valid and the command is pressing personnel to consider Operational Risk Management (ORM) and (b) (6) is taking into account the risks involved with such extended drive times, mitigating risk to himself and other drivers. (b) (6) indicated under the same circumstances, he supports (b) (6) decision to try and make this the safest and most economical trip and (b) (6) weighed the odds of the ORM and tried to stay within the regulations for allowable time driving the vehicle without time off and rest. He did not believe (b) (6) was attempting to defraud the government in any way, shape or form but that (b) (6) thought he was doing the government a favor by saving the money and practicing safety (Exhibit 2).

b. Analysis/Discussion/Conclusion

(1) Multiple credible witnesses provided testimony concerning (b) (6) activities from 14 to 19 May 2014, and his alleged misuse of a GOV. Witness testimony, along with his own statements and admissions, leave no question that (b) (6) staged a GOV at his residence in Redmond with the intent to use the vehicle for domicile to duty purposes from 14 to 19 May 2014. (b) (6) further admitted that he staged a GOV at his residence on four previous occasions, 03 October 2013, 29 October 2013, 09 December 2013, and 07 March 2014.

(2) Multiple mitigating circumstances were conveyed by (b) (6) and (b) (6).

(b) (6) to include attention to ORM/safety and savings of energy/resources. (b) (6) believes his actions have saved the government in terms of energy (6) conservation, and overtime pay. Furthermore, the DTS system is not adequate, or too burdensome, for use with quickly executed trips to Pacific Beach. Moreover, (b) (6) believes he was given permission by his direct supervisor, (b) (6) to stage the GOV at his home for these extra trips to Pacific Beach. Finally, (b) (6) claimed he had not fully read the Rental Agreement forms he has signed in order to check out a GOV.

(3) The mitigating circumstances in this case are outweighed by evidence that (b) (6) was informed of the restrictions for the use of GOVs. (6) Two transportation specialists, (b) (6) and (b) (6) stated that (b) (6) was informed by (b) (6) that he was not allowed to stage a GOV from his home. (b) (6) overheard (b) (6) inform (b) (6) of this fact. (b) (6) specifically stated he informed (b) (6) of the restrictions. (b) (6) agreed in his sworn statement that (b) (6) informed him of the restrictions but attempted to mitigate this by indicating (b) (6) works for (b) (6) had given permission to stage the car from his residence, thus he didn't need to follow (b) (6) instructions. (b) (6) statements do not back up (b) (6) view that he was given permission. (b) (6) claims he did not give permission for (b) (6) to stage a GOV from his home, nor did he know that (b) (6) was doing so. Finally, it is (b) (6) responsibility to read and understand the vehicle Rental Agreement forms provided by PWDE. These forms are clear and inclusive in stating restrictions on GOV use and penalties for misuse. (b) (6) provided five Rental agreement forms signed by (b) (6) since November of 2013.

(4) (b) (6) knowingly misused a GOV from 14 through 19 May 2014, when he staged a GOV at his residence to travel to Pacific Beach on the 15 May, to Naval Base Kitsap on 16 May and did not return the vehicle to NSE until 19 May. He further misused a GOV by his own admission on at least four separate occasions since October of 2013 in violation of 31 U.S. Code 3344, 41 CFR 102-34.200, DoD Instruction 4500.36 and NAVFAC Publication 300. The mitigating circumstances do not outweigh the evidence that (b) (6) was informed about restrictions on domicile to duty use of a GOV. Based on this evidence, the allegation is substantiated.

c. Recommendations.

- 1) Take appropriate administrative action to hold (b) (6) accountable.

d. Disposition.

- 1) Forwarded to higher authority for appropriate administrative and/or corrective action.

4. Interviews and Documents

a. Exhibits (Interviews conducted/documents reviewed).

1. (b) (6), Email, 27 May 2014, 08:18 AM, Subj: FW GOV Incident (G134707N).
 - (b) (6), Email 21 May 2014, 10:01 AM, Subj: FW: GOV Incident (G134707N)
 - (b) (6), Email, 20 May 2014, 12:43 PM, Subj: FW: GOV Incident (G134707N)
 - (b) (6), Email, 19 May 2014, 9:42 AM, Subj: GOV Incident
 - (b) (6), Email, 20 May 2014, 1:41 PM, Subj: Abuse of G.O.V. Privilege
2. (b) (6) Sworn Statement (Unsigned), 10 June 2014, 11:33 AM.
3. (b) (6) Written Statement, Signed, 10 June 2014.
4. (b) (6) Sworn Statement, Signed, 16 June 2014.
5. (b) (6) Sworn Statement, Signed 23 June 2014.
6. GSA Vehicle Reservation form, provided by (b) (6) via email on 29 May 2014.
7. Five Rental Agreement forms signed by (b) (6) Provided by (b) (6) via email on 29 May 2014.
8. Rental Agreement form (highlighted), signed by (b) (6) Provided by (b) (6) to the IO, at the NSE Transportation Shop, on 10 June 2014.
9. (b) (6) Sworn Statement, Signed 16 June 2014.
10. (b) (6) Sworn Statement, (unsigned), 28 May 2014.
11. (b) (6) Email, 05 June 2014, 8:29 AM, Subj: RE: Investigation (b) (6) Everett

Further Documents reviewed

1. (b) (6) Sworn Statement, Signed 23 June 2014.
2. (b) (6) Edmonds Kingston Ferry Receipts, 16 June 2014, Provided by (b) (6), 28 May 2014.
3. Command Organization Chart, July 2013.
4. Interviewee In-Briefing
5. 31 U.S. Code 1344 – Passenger Carrier Use
6. 41 CFR 102-34.200 – What is Official Use of Government Equipment
7. DoD Instruction 4500.36, 11 December 2012 – Acquisition Management, and Use of non-Tactical Vehicles (NTVs)
8. NAVFAC Publication 300 (P-300) Management of Civil Engineering Support Equipment, September 2003.